7/1/71

Dear Howard (Dick),

Relet 29, I can now tell you what I have known from the first, not to worry about the Times articles because Bantam is doing them as a book. The Times may use more than the book, though. Thanks for Marboro order.

One item in Forensic Chemistry makes me suspect it as source, p. 267, Item 9: Goddard did not in fact identify the weapon and his semantics are identical with swearing falsely. Se Cook's review of F-U.

Check on spectro.

My ref to lady was to your citation of something you saw in my files, a report to me by a woman correspondent. You referred to it. I think if you check the letter to which this responds that part will be clear, also the typo(s).

The file from PH is as you describe. Guess I did file and forget.

Re: UPI 1026 pix, showing cyrtains. there is a Black Star showing them being put up. I have contacts. They are diaphanous.

You read Robert correctly. Also Jerry. They know my disagreement.

There was only slight reporting of the arms cache here.

Too early to tell much re N.O., but I am inclined to consider framing. Gervais is expert in that, and if they had enough on him he'd have done it. In anybevent, he'd not do what he did voluntarily, for that means he'll spend the rest of his life in hiding, and he had lived a very good life. Predicting a zany is a futility, but I can't figure HJ as a <u>cheap</u> crook . So far as his campaign contributors are concerned, those are as respectable as the major contibutors to the national parties and not as dubious as one of Jim's, a far-right fascist. To me they are less of a natiobal hazard than those who control the DJ. The real question is did he knowingly take graft? This I have to be convinced, and what I've read is not convincing. It looks as though they saw a chance to ring him in on a solid case and they did. But I also believe the feds will come up with more, including Alford. Even the Wash Post is questioning. Privately. The TV treatment was remarkably straight.

Sincerely,